PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220 Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220 International application No. PCT/EP2004/014901 International filing date (day/month/year) 22.12.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC H04L9/32 Applicant EADS TELECOM 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. II Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. VI Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA) and the chose	PINION OF THE EARCHING AUTHORITY ule 43bis.1) TASA/210 (second sheet) date (day/month/year) .2003			
See form PCT/ISA/220 Applicant's or agent's file reference See form PCT/ISA/220 International application No. PCT/EP2004/014901 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC HO4L9/3/2 Applicant EADS TELECOM 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. II Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However witten opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However witten opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However witten opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However witten opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However the life Agent the objects in the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However the life Agent the objects in the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However the life Agent the objects in the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However the life Agent the objects in the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However the life Agent the objects in the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However the chief Agent the objects in the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However the chief Agent the objects in the International Preliminary Examination IPEA international Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"	PINION OF THE EARCHING AUTHORITY LITE 43bis.1) TASA/210 (second sheet) date (day/month/year)			
Applicant's or agent's file reference See form PCT/ISA/220 International application No. PCT/EP2004/014901 International filing date (day/month/year) 22.12.2004 Priority 23.12 Applicant EADS TELECOM International relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. II Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA) and the chose	ARCHING AUTHORITY ule 43bis.1) T/ISA/210 (second sheet) date (day/month/year)			
Applicant's or agent's file reference See form PCT/ISA/220 International application No. PCT/EP2004/014901 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC H04L9/32 Applicant EADS TELECOM 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. VI Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VII Certain documents cited Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However the character of the charac	date (day/month/year)			
See paragraph 2 below	date (day/month/year)			
International application No. PCT/EP2004/014901 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC H04L9/32 Applicant EADS TELECOM 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Priority Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, and the INSEA and the chose				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC H04L9/32 Applicant EADS TELECOM 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 1. This opinion of the International Preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the period of the Conservations of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the period of the Conservations of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the period of the Conservations of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the period of the Conservations of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the period of the Conservations of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the IPEA and the Conservations of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA").				
Applicant EADS TELECOM 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application				
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. I Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application				
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. I □ Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II □ Priority □ Box No. III □ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step □ Box No. IV □ Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V □ Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI □ Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII □ Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII □ Certain observations on the international application				
 ☑ Box No. II Priority ☐ Box No. III Priority ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention ☑ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, where the IREA and the chose 				
□ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA").				
□ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, when the IREA and the chose				
 □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, where the IREA and the chose 	and industrial applicability			
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the present the triangle of the chose	and moderna approximation,			
 □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the present the transfer of the IPEA and the chose 	, inventive step or industrial			
□ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, when the the IPEA and the chose				
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the content of the IPEA and the chose				
2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, and the chose				
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usuall written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, the present the choice of the IREA and the choice				
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.				
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, be months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 whichever expires later.	ne applicant is invited to fore the expiration of three nonths from the priority date,			
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.				
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.				
Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer	·			

Borges, P

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4394



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/014901

_		·	
	Вох	No. I Basis of the opinion	
1.	. With regard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.		
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).	
2.	With	regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and essary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:	
	a. ty	pe of material:	
		a sequence listing	
	Ε	table(s) related to the sequence listing	
	b. fo	rmat of material:	
		in written format	
		in computer readable form	
	c. tii	ne of filing/furnishing:	
		contained in the international application as filed.	
	[filed together with the international application in computer readable form.	
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.	
4.	Add	itional comments:	

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/EP2004/014901

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-13

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-13

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims No: Claims 1-13

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: FR 2 839 594 A (RADIO SYSTEMES INGENIERIE) 14 November 2003 (2003-11-14)

2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

Method of transmitting information with verification of transmission errors, wherein a useful information message (Fig. 2, message reçu) is transmitted in a determined frame while being associated with a determined number p of transmission error verification bits (Fig 2: 16 bits for MAC plus the bits indicated as CRC 16) also transmitted in said determined frame, wherein a determined number p1 (Fig 2, 16 bits for MAC) of said p transmission error verification bits form a seal (FIG 2, MAC) obtained from the useful information message using a determined sealing function (Fig 1, CALCUL MAC), where p1 is a number less than p, and

wherein the p-p1 remaining transmission error verification bits form a cyclic redundancy code (Fig. 2, CRC 16) calculated from the useful information message.

3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 7

Claim 7 is an apparatus claim with means corresponding to the respective steps of claim 1. The reasoning applied to claim 1, in section 2 above, applies mutatis mutandis to claim 7.

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 7 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/014901

- DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-6, 8-13
 Dependent claims 2 to 6 and 8 to 13 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).
- In order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application with the requirements of Article 34(2)(b) PCT, the applicant is requested to clearly identify the amendments carried out, no matter whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate the passages of the application as filed on which these amendments are based (see also Rule 66.8(a) PCT).

If the applicant regards it as appropriate these indications could be submitted in handwritten form on a copy of the relevant parts of the application as filed.